
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/21/3288494
19 Crosthwaite Way, Slough SL1 6ET

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Dibble against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: P/06493/002, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is dormer extensions to the roof to allow the conversion of loft space.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The description of development above has been taken from the planning application form and differs slightly from the description on the refusal notice and appeal form. However both descriptions adequately describe the proposal.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

4. No 19 Crosthwaite Way falls in the central part of an estate of bungalows of similar design. There is a strong sense of uniformity along this street and the wider area resulting from the consistent form and scale of dwellings. Many have been altered by the addition of roof windows set into the plane of the existing roof, and a few have been altered with dormers of a similar box-like design to those proposed in this case.
5. I have no information which indicates whether the few dormer extensions have been permitted following the consideration of a planning application, or whether they have benefitted from permission granted by a development order (permitted development). Notwithstanding that lack of information, the box like dormers I observed around the locality, with flat roofs extending out from close to ridge height, demonstrate a fundamental lack of design quality.
6. The proposed dormers in the case before me also exhibit that lack of design quality. I agree with the Council that the bulk and scale of the dormers would not respect the simple form of the host dwelling. The proposal would add large

box like structures to the existing simple roof structure which would be incongruous and out of place. Because of their positioning they would be obtrusive elements in the street scene when viewed from Crosthwaite Way. Despite other similar dormer extensions in the vicinity the character of the street is overwhelmingly defined by the simple design of the existing bungalows with their sloping roof planes. This proposal would undermine that existing character and would be visually harmful to the appearance of the area.

7. I understand the desire to maximise the use of space in the dwelling and recognise that permitted development may allow an alternative proposal to be implemented. But neither of these matters justifies the construction of what would be a fundamentally inappropriate addition to the existing dwelling.
8. Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough (LP) are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in requiring a high standard of design and for extensions to be compatible with the original structure. The proposal is in conflict with these policies. There is also conflict with Core Policy H15, which includes similar design objectives. Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework also requires high quality design which respects its location and surroundings. This proposal would conflict with those aims.

Other Matters

9. The Council refused planning permission partly on the basis that the proposal would be harmful to neighbouring living conditions with regard to overlooking and overbearing effects. I do not share that concern given the proposed configuration of the dormers and positioning of windows. However this finding is not sufficient to outweigh the significant harm identified in relation to the main issue.

Overall Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Major

Inspector